



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Kuang-Lieh Lu et al

Art Unit : 1624

Serial No. : 10/056,269

Examiner : Mark L. Berch

Filed : January 24, 2002

Title : PRISMATIC SUPRAMOLECULES

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

FEB 14 2003

RECEIVED

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the office action dated October 29, 2002, Applicants elect the invention of Group II, i.e., claims 23-45, drawn to tetragonal compounds and synthesis thereof. (Note that "II. Claims 23-25" should read "II. Claims 23-45" in the office action.)

The election is made with traverse. More specifically, Applicants request that the invention of Group III be examined together with the invention of Group II for the reasons below:

To impose a proper requirement for restriction requires, the inventions must be "either independent or distinct" (emphases added). See the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 803. The pending claims all cover prismatic supramolecules or their synthesis. Indeed, the compounds have similar designs (see the formulas recited in claims 1, 23, and 46, respectively) and similar properties (i.e., neutral and luminescent; see page 2, line 5 of the Specification). Further, all of them can be prepared by essentially the same methodology (see page 13, line 23 through page 14, line 17). In other words, the inventions of Groups I, II and III are not independent.

Indeed, the Examiner has classified the invention of Group III in "class 546, subclass 2" (emphases added), to which, the Examiner has concluded, a number of compounds of Groups II

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date of Deposit

January 29, 2003

Signature

Sue Key

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

Anne B

also belong (i.e., "class 540; 544[;] 546, subclass 145; 179; 2"; emphases added). Thus, search for the invention of Group II will automatically cover search for the invention of Group III. Accordingly, Applicants request that Group III be examined together with Group III.

In this connection, Applicants would like to point out that "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." Also see the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 803. Here, as discussed above, the inventions of the three groups are not independent. Yet, in the sole interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants are willing to elect, and have elected, Group II for search and examination. However, no additional burden would have to be carried to also search for the invention of Group III, and only slightly more burden would have to be carried to also examine the invention of Group III, which contains only 9 claims. Clearly, considering Group III separately from Group II would be a waste of the resources of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Please apply any charges to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1-29-03

Y. Rocky Tsao

Rocky Tsao, Ph.D., J.D.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 34,053

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906  
20578040.doc